(2, 3)

11 FEB 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Special Activities

SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Object

REFERENCE: [redacted] Attachments, 1 Feb 65

1. Detailed analysis of the [redacted] of 19 November 1964 and review of associated correspondence indicate that there was, in fact, no high altitude ultra-high-speed UFO north of [redacted] during the [redacted] period. There were, however, apparently valid tracks and/or observations of unidentified aircraft in the vicinity of the [redacted] on 16, 17, 18, 19, and 24 November 1964.

2. Relative to the incident during the evening of 19 November, the US Navy F-8C pilot was able to distinguish the object as a delta shape about the size of a jet fighter, reported it as having much higher performance, and estimated object speed to be in excess of Mach 2. The [redacted] reported a radar track in excess of 3200 knots.

3. During this incident, [redacted] were taken of the [redacted] presentation. Analysis of these photographs show a good track in excess of 300 n.m. for the object in question. The object was flying a course of about 165° relative to the [redacted] at a relative speed of about 455 knots.

11 FEB 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Special Activities

SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Object

REFERENCE: [redacted] Attachments, 1 Feb 65

1. Detailed analysis of the [redacted] of 19 November 1964 and review of associated correspondence indicate that there was, in fact, no high altitude ultra-high-speed UFO north of [redacted] during the [redacted] period. There were, however, apparently valid tracks and/or observations of unidentified aircraft in the vicinity of the [redacted] on 16, 17, 18, 19, and 24 November 1964.

2. Relative to the incident during the evening of 19 November, the US Navy F-8C pilot was able to distinguish the object as a delta shape about the size of a jet fighter, reported it as having much higher performance, and estimated object speed to be in excess of Mach 2. The [redacted] reported a radar track in excess of 3200 knots.

a. During this incident, [redacted] were taken of the [redacted] presentation. Analysis of these photographs show a good track in excess of 300 n.m. for the object in question. The object was flying a course of about 165° relative to the [redacted] at a relative speed of about 455 knots.

213

SUBJECT: Unidentified Flying Object

b. At the time, the radar was undergoing an evaluation test program -- hence, the use of a recording camera.

3. In view of the and pilot observation, it is concluded that the so-called UFO on 19 November was probably a delta-wing fighter of a type having a significantly higher climb performance than the F-5C at the 50,000 foot altitude regime. Based on the limited information provided in the associated correspondence, other objects reported during the period of 16 to 24 November would appear to be unidentified aircraft.

4. Apparently, missile test firings were scheduled during this time period, and it is conceivable that the area in question could have been an attractive target for reconnaissance. The was located 325 n.m. from the eastern during the 19 November incident, well within MiG-21 range. The USSR has a MiG-21 reconnaissance configuration There is no evidence at hand to suggest or deny any MiG-21 reconnaissance activity based

Karl H. Weber
for DONALD F. CHAMBERLAIN
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence

Attachments:
Three attachments to

Distribution:
Cy 1 & 2 - Addressee (w/attach)
Cy 3 & 4 - AD/SI
Cy 5 & 6 - DSD/SI
Cy 7 & 8 - ADB/DSD/SI

OK to release

OSI/DSD/ADB/WAGray:ldl/6621 (10 Feb 65)

MEMORANDUM FOR : Director, Photographic Intelligence Center

SUBJECT : Reported Photography of UFO's

REFERENCE : Your Memo PIC-7-58, dated 1 October 1958, Same Subject

1. Your referenced interesting memorandum has been reviewed thoroughly within this Office. Although my Applied Science Division assumes responsibility for UFO's, I considered it appropriate to refer this case to the Air Force wherein primary community responsibility lies. Referral was accomplished by forwarding a copy of your memorandum to AFCIN.

2. Your third paragraph opens an interesting question to which I am not at all certain I have the solution. Nevertheless, for you to procure Mr. Fine's photographs and determine more about his experiments, my suggestions are:

a. That you approach him

perhaps as one interested in purchasing/photographic research.

b. That you seek advice from the AD/O relative to other avenues of approach with which he may well be familiar.

HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence